

**CONFIDENTIAL**

25 August 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Training

SUBJECT : Executive Development Program and the Training Function

REFERENCE : (a) Memo dtd 9 Aug 72 to D/Pers from C/Plans Staff/OP, "Training and Personnel Development"  
(b) Draft Memo dtd 11 Aug 72 to Deputy Directors, "Personnel Development Program"

Having reviewed the guidelines established by the Civil Service Commission and the Office of Management and Budget for an executive development program in the Federal Service, and studied the "Personnel Development Program" proposed for the Agency in Reference (b), it seems to me that we are on the right track conceptually. From the practicable standpoint, however, I question the wisdom of inaugurating an essentially unproven program on a crash, massive basis throughout the Agency. To do so would ignore a number of factors crucial to the success of any personnel development program--the diverse structure and functions of the Agency; the changing requirements placed upon us by the ebb and flow of international events; and today's fund of knowledge about organizational development.

In order that these observations not be construed as opposition to a systematic personnel development program, nor be dismissed as founded in vague generalities, I should like to present some specific thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of this proposal, couched within the framework of the five guidelines established by CSC/OMB.

CLASSIFIED BY	17-1517
EXEMPT FROM	
SCHEDULE OF	
§ 5B(1), (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28) (29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (34) (35) (36) (37) (38) (39) (40) (41) (42) (43) (44) (45) (46) (47) (48) (49) (50) (51) (52) (53) (54) (55) (56) (57) (58) (59) (60) (61) (62) (63) (64) (65) (66) (67) (68) (69) (70) (71) (72) (73) (74) (75) (76) (77) (78) (79) (80) (81) (82) (83) (84) (85) (86) (87) (88) (89) (90) (91) (92) (93) (94) (95) (96) (97) (98) (99) (100)	
AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED ON	
(unless impossible, insert date or event)	

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1. The necessity of high-level organizational commitment: Past efforts to implement systematic personnel development programs on any notable scale in this Agency failed precisely because they lacked this commitment and the organizational discipline to accompany it. This is more than a guideline. It is an absolute requisite, not just in the first instance, but more importantly in the longer term when initial enthusiasm and interest at all levels can easily give way to short-term personnel requirements and other "realities". One need only look to the history of the mid-1960s and our experience with the Career Training Program and the Midcareer Executive Development Program. Both received high-level endorsements as long-term personnel development programs, but their developmental aspects ceased almost immediately following formal training because operating components were unable or unwilling for a variety of reasons to implement them.

The establishment of an executive development program as high-level policy in the Agency is an excellent beginning, but the simple submission of an annual report by the several career services does not by itself constitute the kind of discipline needed to assure effective implementation. I suggest that a mechanism other than the Executive Committee (i. e., the Deputy Directors, a very busy group of men indeed) is needed to monitor and assure implementation and progress.

2. The necessity of a developmental plan: Recognizing we are obligated to submit to the Civil Service Commission by 30 September a report on an Agency executive development plan, I nevertheless am concerned that the plan, accomplished in haste against a short deadline, will not be subjected to the critical study and testing needed before significant aspects of it are put in motion. The planned professional development of our middle and senior level officers certainly is a far reaching issue and false steps could be most costly.

To begin with, the magnitude of the approach within the timetable suggested is overwhelming. The schedule calls for the review by 31 December 1972 of the records of all officers in grades

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

GS-11 through -17 and the compilation of plans for developmental assignments and training for a considerable though unspecified number of them. Such plans would not be limited to those judged to have executive potential, but would involve the development of officers on a broader scale. There are some [redacted] officers in this range, distributed among approximately 25 Career Services. The task is enormous and certainly not capable of accomplishment within the timetable proposed.

25X9

More basically, however, I question whether or not such detailed personnel planning is desirable, let alone possible, in our Agency. There are numerous variables and contingencies in the intelligence profession which would drastically change the best conceived developmental plans. I believe we could, in a more liberal time frame, devise individual developmental plans, as proposed, but I think a lot of the effort would be wasted as unexpected crises, demands for new skills, and new organizational programs occur. In my opinion the proposal is too ambitious, complex, and detailed to become a viable program.

It is also untested and unproven. It is being recommended that the Agency put all its effort into this single approach. If it is not the right approach, it is a mistake on a gigantic scale and we would still be faced with developing an alternative. I believe we ought to begin more modestly with several pilot projects in various components and only after better knowledge about possible techniques is achieved by those required to implement the developmental programs, i. e., members of Career Service Boards and unit supervisors.

One of the matters which really bothers me about this proposal is the problem of identifying officers with executive potential. The proposal calls upon the Career Services to do this, but does not suggest how it might be done. This entire effort presumably is being undertaken to introduce a "change" element into the picture, to enable Federal agencies to improve their capabilities for selecting and developing their executive personnel. The program would rely heavily on management training, and properly so, but it does not come to grips with the question of identifying officers

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

who would be the best subjects for such training. We have already made the point in an earlier memorandum on this question that to give management training to a large body of officers on the premise that somewhere among them we will hit the future managers is a waste of both personnel and training assets.

I strongly suggest that further work is needed on the matter of identifying officers with executive potential, specifying at what stage(s) of their careers this should be done and by what possible methods. I am proposing, later in this paper, some modification of our own training in the management field to take account of this need within the organization. Here I would only suggest that we capitalize on the experiences of some other organizations in this respect, among them the Internal Revenue Service, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and the Department of Labor. I also believe that the Psychological Services Staff of the Office of Medical Services is examining this question of whether or not you can, in fact, spot personnel with high promise as managers.

3. Stress mobility in development programs: The question of rotating personnel among the Directorates is complicated and not susceptible to treatment here. I would point out, however, that OTR's forthcoming "Profile of Courses" includes the core program, which is designed to expand the students' knowledge of Agency responsibilities, problems, and processes, and the general training category directed specifically at training personnel in skills for Agencywide application. As such, they provide a training dimension to an officer rotation program.

4. Use training resources: In general, I believe that our "Profile of Courses" is highly compatible with a systematic program for professional development, relating not only to middle and senior level officers, but to junior officers as well. The Profile has been described fully in earlier memoranda on the subject of training and personnel development and I think needs no further elaboration here.

I would propose, however, some modifications in our training to dovetail more closely with executive development. First of all, insertion into the Intelligence and World Affairs Course of

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100300022-1

introductory material related to information science and the management of one's own work flow is a proper beginning. The Managerial Grid as a sequel within the first three to five years of employment is also sound. At the next step, however, I suggest a modification in the core program having to do with the Fundamentals of Supervision and Management. This would require a more precise statement of the student body for whom the course is intended. At the moment, it is designed for "supervisors and prospective supervisors at all levels of the Agency". A member of the Management Training Faculty has suggested, wisely I think, that all first-line supervisors be required to take the course either shortly before or shortly after being appointed to such position. This, of course, would require all the organizational discipline the Agency can muster to assure compliance. At the moment, the course enrollment includes personnel at various levels and differing responsibilities. While such a "mix" has proved stimulating to participants, its contribution to organizational development in any systematic sense is questionable.

Next, because the Personnel Development Program seems to be concentrating so heavily on officers at the level of GS-13 and above, I recommend we consider offering the Midcareer Course to GS-13s only, eliminating both -12s and 14s. Please note that I am not recommending enrollment be limited to GS-13s designated for executive development. It should include highly-regarded officers who are not necessarily potential executives. By limiting enrollment to GS-13s, I believe we can practice greater precision and discipline in our own contribution to personnel development at what is being identified as a key crossover grade in the program.

Further, I suggest that we seriously consider establishing a course for branch chiefs, nominees and recent appointees, which would provide training on as close an applied basis as possible. The Managerial Grid should be a minimum prerequisite for enrollment in the course. Course content should be developed following intensive study of the generic responsibilities and training needs of branch chiefs throughout the Agency, but certainly would include situational problems and case studies. The grade levels of

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100300022-1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

enrolled officers probably would be GS-15, in the case of the Clandestine Service, and GS-14 for the rest of the Agency. Again, organizational discipline would be needed to assure that such officers actually receive this training. The course, I believe, should be separate from the Midcareer Course.

At the moment, OTR has a management training program for senior officers (GS-15/18) enrolled in the Senior Seminar. This is a group of 25-30 officers annually. Under development is a Leadership Conference for very senior officers to be designated by the Executive Director-Comptroller. There is, however, a large body of officers, grades GS-14/17 roughly, who are either occupying or headed for managerial positions who will not have access to either of these programs for a considerable period of time, if at all. The group includes, for example, most of the more than 1,000 graduates of the Midcareer Course and a still larger number of their peers who have not taken that course.

Here, I think, is a real training gap we ought to try to close if we can develop the resources. There are specific courses which officers in this, as well as other categories, can take, including the new Information Science series and the Budget Process. But it would seem they also require a program emphasizing the whole range of management theory and techniques that junior and middle level officers, identified as potential executives, will be receiving on a more systematic basis throughout their careers. I would not see a program for these senior officers as a continuing effort necessarily because, with the evolution of time and experience the officers selected and trained in the branch chief's program, the need would gradually be eliminated. The management training program appropriate for these officers should be similar to the Leadership Conference now being planned for "our most senior officers", although less high-powered.

5. The necessity of an evaluation program: No proposal has been submitted as yet in response to this guideline, but Mr. Colby of course has already recommended that, at the very least, there be a post-training audit to determine if there is a correlation between training and an officer's performance on-the-job and his advancement. There are many aspects of a personnel development program which would have to be evaluated, in addition to the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

training aspects, including the means for identifying officers with executive potential; the degree to which developmental plans have actually been implemented; and, above all, whether this approach or some alternative(s) would be more effective.

Finally, despite all our earlier recommendations, there is not within the proposal any raising of the problem of increasing the effectiveness of the component training officer as part of this entire process. I continue to believe that his being selected on an enlightened basis, taking account of his thorough knowledge of functional expertise and training opportunities, is critically important. His participation in the personnel planning and development function is equally important.

When one comes right down to it, the proposal calls upon the career services to initiate a broad program of personnel planning and development without providing to them very much practical assistance in the way of managerial techniques and tools to do the job. I think that a great deal more careful thought--and a willingness to proceed in stages with more modest objectives--are dictated.

25X1A

  
Special Assistant  
for

Curriculum Development

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~